UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 1 DISTRICT OF DELAWARE 2 3 IN RE: Chapter 11 Case No. 25-10475 (TMH) 4 VILLAGE ROADSHOW ENTERTAINMENT GROUP (Joint Administration Requested) 5 USA, INC., et al., Courtroom No. 7 824 Market Street 6 Wilmington, Delaware 19801 Debtors. 7 Tuesday, March 18, 2025 10:00 a.m. 8 9 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 10 BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS M. HORAN UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE 11 12 APPEARANCES: 13 For the Debtors: Joseph M. Mulvihill, Esquire YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP 14 Rodney Square 1000 North King Street Wilmington, Delaware 19801 15 16 17 18 19 (APPEARANCES CONTINUED) 20 Audio Operator: Ian Willoughby, ECRO Transcription Company: 21 Reliable The Nemours Building 1007 N. Orange Street, Suite 110 22 Wilmington, Delaware 19801 23 Telephone: (302)654-8080 Email: gmatthews@reliable-co.com 24 Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, 25 transcript produced by transcription service.

1	<u>APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)</u> :			
2	For the Debtors:	Justin R. Bernbrock, Esquire Matthew T. Benz, Esquire SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER		
4		& HAMPTON, LLP 321 North Clark Street		
5		32nd Floor Chicago, Illinois 60654		
6		Alyssa Paddock, Esquire		
7		30 Rockefeller Plaza 39th Floor		
8		New York, New York 10112		
9	For Warner Bros. Entertainment, Inc. and its Affiliates:			
10		Matthew B. Harvey, Esquire MORRIS NICHOLS ARSHT & TUNNELL, LLF		
11		1201 North Market Street #1600		
12		Wilmington, Delaware 19801 -and-		
13		-and-		
14		Stephen H. Warren, Esquire O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP 400 South Hope Street		
15		Suite 1900 Los Angeles, California 90071		
16		105 migeres, carriornia 90071		
17	For Alcon Media Group:	Vadim J. Rubinstein, Esquire LOEB & LOEB, LLP		
18		345 Park Avenue New York, New York 10154		
19		New Tork, New Tork Toron		
20	For the U.S. Trustee:	Rosa Sierra-Fox, Esquire OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE		
21		J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building 844 North King Street		
22		Suite 2207, Lockbox 35 Wilmington, Delaware 19801		
23				
24				
25				
	I .			

1	<u>APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)</u> :	
2	For U.S. Bank National Association:	Aaron Gavant, Esquire
3		BARNES & THORNBURG, LLP One North Wacker Drive Suite 4400
5		Chicago, Illinois 60606
6	For SAG-AFTRA, DGA, WGA-West, and MPIPHP:	David E. Ahdoot, Esquire BUSH GOTTLIEB 801 North Brand Boulevard
7		
8		Suite 950 Glendale, California 91203
9		
10	For 1397225 Ontario Limited and Falcon Strategic Partners IV:	
11 12		Christopher M. Samis, Esquire POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON, LLP 1313 North Market Street
13		6th Floor Wilmington, Delaware 19801
14		-and-
15		James A. Newton, Esquire
16		MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP 250 West 55th Street New York, New York 10019
17		New Tolk, New Tolk 10013
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1		INDEX	
2	MOTIONS:		PAGE
3	Agenda		0.0
4	Item 3:	Debtors' Motion for Entry of an Order (I) Directing Joint Administration of Chapter 11 Cases and (II) Granting Related Relief	20
5		[Docket No. 3, 3/17/25]	
6		Court's Ruling:	21
7 8	Agenda Item 4:	Debtors' Motion for Entry of an Order (I) Approving the Retention and Appointment of	21
9		Kurtzman Carson Consultants LLC, dba Verita Global, as the Claims and Noticing Agent to	
10		the Debtors, Effective as Petition Date and (II) Granting Related Relief	
11		[Docket No. 4, 3/17/25]	
12		Court's Ruling:	23
13	Agenda Item 5:	Debtors' Motion for Entry Interim and Final Orders (I) Authorizing the Redaction of	23
14		Certain Personally Identifiable Information of Individuals from the Consolidated List of Creditors and Certain Other Filings and (II) Granting Related Relief [Docket No. 5, 3/1725]	
16		Court's Ruling:	24
17	Agenda		
18	Item 6:	Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders (I) Authorizing the Payment of Certain Prepetition Taxes and Fees and Related Obligations, (II) Authorizing Banks to Honor	
19			
20		Process Check and Electronic Transfer Requests Related Thereto, and (III) Granting Related	
21		Relief [Docket No. 6, 3/17/25]	
22		Court's Ruling:	25
23			
24			
25			

1	INDEX			
2	MOTIONS:		PAGE	
3	Agenda		26	
4	Item 7:	Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders (I) Authorizing the Debtors to (A) Continue to Operate Their Cash Management		
5		System, (B) Honor Certain Prepetition Obligations Related Thereto, (C) Maintain Existing Business Forms, (D) Continue Intercompany Transactions; (II) Confirming		
6				
7		Administrative Expense Priority for Postpetition Intercompany Claims; and (III) Granting Related Relief [Docket No. 7, 3/17/25]		
9			34	
10		Court's Ruling:	34	
11	Agenda Item 8:	Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final	34	
12		Orders (I) Authorizing the Debtors to (A) Pay Prepetition Employee Wages, Salaries, Other Compensation, and Reimbursable Employee		
13 14		Expenses and (B) Continue Employee Benefits Programs; and (II) Granting Related Relief [Docket No. 8, 3/17/25]		
15		Court's Ruling:	37	
16	Agenda Item 9:	Debtage! Matica for Entering of Interim and Einel	38	
17	rtem 9:	Debtors' Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders (I) Authorizing the Debtors to (A) Obtain Postpetition Financing and (B) Utilize		
18		Cash Collateral, (II) Granting Liens and Superpriority Administrative Expense Claims,		
19		(III) Granting Adequate Protection, (IV) Modifying the Automatic Stay, (V) Scheduling a		
20		Final Hearing, and (VI) Granting Related Relief [Docket No. 9, 3/17/25]		
21		Court's Ruling:	71	
22		ooure b Ruring.	, ±	
23				
24				
25				

Case 25-10475-TMH	Doc 93	Filed 03/24/25	Page 6 of 77

EXHIBITS DECLARATIONS: PAGE 1) Declaration of Keith Maib 2) Declaration of George N. Koutsonicolis 3) Declaration of Evan Gershbein Transcriptionists' Certificate 

(Proceedings commenced at 10:00 a.m.) 1 THE CLERK: All rise. 2 THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. 3 Good morning, Mr. Mulvihill. 4 5 MR. MULVIHILL: Good morning, Your Honor. For the record, Joseph Mulvihill, Young Conaway 6 7 Stargatt & Taylor, proposed counsel to Village Roadshow 8 Entertainment Group USA, Inc. and its affiliated debtors. 9 At the outset of today's hearing, Your Honor, we'd 10 like to thank you for making time to hear us for our first day pleadings. I'd like to introduce with me in court today 11 is my colleague Christopher Lambe, but I'm also joined by the 12 13 Sheppard Mullin team. 14 After I make a few introductory remarks, Your 15 Honor, I'll turn it over to Mr. Bernbrock, who will introduce 16 the rest of the team and give Your Honor a brief presentation 17 on the company. 18 THE COURT: Great. 19 MR. MULVIHILL: Your Honor, just as a housekeeping 20 matter, we were able to schedule a second hearing with your 21 chambers prior today; I'd like to put that on the record. 22 It'll be April 11th at 1:30 p.m. 23 THE COURT: Yes. MR. MULVIHILL: And that will be for our second 24 25 day hearing and also our bid procedures will be scheduled for

that.

We filed our agenda today, Your Honor, at Docket 21. There have been a few updates since then, as Your Honor might expect. Most importantly, a revised budget was filed at Docket 47, with respect to the DIP. I wanted to make sure Your Honor had that; if not, I can hand up a copy at the appropriate time when we get to the DIP motion.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MULVIHILL: We'd also like to thank Ms. Sierra Fox for working cooperatively with us in advance of the hearing. We've been able to resolve, I believe, almost everything for the routine first days, Your Honor. I will say we're completely resolved. There'll be a couple of revisions that we're going to put on the record as we move through, I believe, it's with respect to cash management -
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MULVIHILL: -- and we are 95 percent of the way there on the DIP, Your Honor; still incorporating comments from various parties, which we will get to. I believe there's one open issue with the U.S. Trustee and those will be addressed in due course as we move through the hearing.

Finally, Your Honor, we have two declarations in support of our hearing today. The first is from Keith Maib; he's our chief restructuring officer. That is our first day

1 declaration filed at Docket 2. 2 At this time, Your Honor, I would move that into 3 evidence. THE COURT: Does anybody object to the admission 4 5 of Mr. Maib's declaration, purely for the purposes of today's 6 hearing? 7 (No verbal response) THE COURT: Okay. I hear no response. 8 9 Mr. Maib's declaration is admitted. 10 (Maib Declaration received in evidence) 11 THE COURT: Is there anybody who would like to 12 cross-examine Mr. Maib? 13 (No verbal response) THE COURT: I hear no response. 14 15 MR. MULVIHILL: Thank you, Your Honor. The second declaration is from Mr. Koutsonicolis, 16 17 who is our investment banker; that's in support of the DIP, 18 filed at Docket 10. 19 At this time, Your Honor, we would also like to 20 move that into evidence. THE COURT: Okay. Does anybody object to the 21 22 admission of Mr. Koutsonicolis, but it's Koutsonicolis. 23 MR. MULVIHILL: Your Honor, I spent a lot of time this morning practicing that, as well --24 25 THE COURT: Well, I appreciate that.

```
1
               MR. MULVIHILL: -- and I think I still might have
2
   gotten it wrong -- I got it right for the first time, thank
 3
   you.
               THE COURT: It's important to get it right.
 4
 5
               Is there anybody who objects to the admission of
 6
   Mr. Koutsonicolis' declaration for the purposes of today's
7
   hearing?
8
          (No verbal response)
9
               THE COURT: I hear no response.
               It is admitted.
10
          (Koutsonicolis Declaration received in evidence)
11
12
               THE COURT: Is there anybody here who would like
   to cross-examine Mr. Koutsonicolis?
13
14
          (No verbal response)
15
               THE COURT: I hear no response.
               MR. MULVIHILL: Thank you, Your Honor.
16
17
               Unless you have any questions for me at this time,
18
    I'll cede the podium to my co-counsel, Justin Bernbrock.
19
               THE COURT: I have no questions.
20
               Mr. Bernbrock, good morning. Welcome.
21
               MR. BERNBROCK: Thank you.
22
               Good morning, Your Honor. Justin Bernbrock of
23
   Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, proposed counsel to the
    debtors and debtors-in-possession.
24
25
               Your Honor, I'd like to echo Mr. Mulvihill's
```

thanks to Your Honor and Your Honor's staff for accommodating the hearing today. Also, to Ms. Sierra Fox for working with us over the weekend late, late hours and we're very appreciative for those efforts.

On the walk over to the courtroom this morning, it occurred to me with three first day hearings in this courthouse that the great obsession of every debtor lawyer at the first day hearing is to make a splash and given that these debtors are in the entertainment business, I thought that I might try to reenact the great scene from Willy Wonka & the Chocolate Factory where Gene Wilder appears frail and fragile while he's leaving the chocolate factory, only to plant his cane and do a somersault and I thought that might work; although, I'm no Gene Wilder and the last time I did a somersault, I had a broken leg on account of it.

(Laughter)

MR. BERNBROCK: Your Honor, I do want to make some additional introductions. My partner Jennifer Nassiri is with us in the courtroom; our colleague Alyssa Paddock and Matthew Benz. We've also got, as Mr. Mulvihill said, Mr. Keith Maib, who's the chief restructuring officer of the debtors; Mr. George Koutsonicolis, proposed investment banker to the debtors. We also got a number of folks on the Zoom line; notably, the company's chief operating officer, Mr. Louis Santor, and the company's general counsel and

secretary, Mr. Kevin Berg. There are also members of the Board on the Zoom, as well.

Also in the courtroom -- the other great aspect of being a debtor lawyer is that when you have a new case, you make all sorts of new friends, and some folks who we hope will become friends. We've got counsel to the DIP lenders, Mr. Newton, and his Delaware counsel in the courtroom. Back of the courtroom is Mr. Hammerman from the Latham firm; they represent the buyer of the assets or proposed buyer.

Mr. Gavant from Barnes & Thornburg, to my left, is ABS trustee counsel. We've got Ms. Kaufman here who represents the various guilds and her co-counsel, a very dear friend, Mr. Ahdoot is on the Zoom. And then, of course, the folks from Morris Nichols, Mr. Harvey is here, and I believe his co-counsel from the O'Melveny firm, and they represent Warner Bros.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BERNBROCK: All that said, Your Honor, I would like to briefly go through a presentation, if I may, and just to give Your Honor a sense of the company, how we got here, what we anticipate or hope to do in the context of Chapter 11, and what that timeline might look like, and then we'll talk a little bit about the proposed financing.

So, go ahead and share that screen, please.

Now, as Your Honor may have seen in the filings,

Village Roadshow Entertainment Group is an independent motion picture and TV financier and production house and has been operating since the late '90s, 1997, in fact. They have released and been involved with over a hundred motion pictures, some really interesting and critically acclaimed pictures, indeed, and the overall box office receipts, on account of the projects is a little over \$19 billion.

Thirty-four, number-one, box office openings. In connection with the projects, 19 Academy Awards were issued and 6 Golden Globes. Some of the projects include The Joker, The Great Gatsby, the Ocean series, that movie Sully, the LEGO Movie, and The Matrix trilogy. I want to put a marker here, The Matrix, or at least one of The Matrix movies, in connection or that the company has been involved with, is the subject of some disputes with Warner Bros.

Next slide.

So, when Village was created, back in 1997, the idea was that it would be an independent house that would partner with major studios to co-finance projects and also share in the upside of those. And you see here, the various dates when movies and other projects were released.

In 2017, the company was acquired by Vine

Alternative Investments and several of its affiliated funds

and then the company continued thereafter. And after that

acquisition, and we'll talk a little more later, the company

did explore some ventures, most notably, an independent studio venture, and that's -- if you see at the top, the motion picture Cinnamon was one of the projects to emerge from that process.

Next slide.

So, it's a complicated company. There's a multinational components to the company. There's entities in Australia, and BVI, and the United States and those are really the main jurisdictions for the company's entities.

There are two principal funded debt silos, what we would commonly call the "senior secured notes" and the ABS or "asset-backed securities" facility.

When you think about the business and the company, on an asset basis, you know, there's only three categories.

There's the film library, certain derivative rights, and the independent studio business.

Next slide.

So, this is the broad overview of the debtors' enterprise structure. The -- and we'll get more granular in the next slide. We will get more granular in the next slide -- ah, perfect.

So, Your Honor, what we are attempting to do here is show the entities in the structure that make up the film library. These are the owners of the library assets. These entities are also sellers under the proposed stalking horse

purchase agreement. They are also entities that are obligors under the ABS facility.

And I do want to be very candid and clear, as you'll see, the boxes that are outlined in the red, those are entities that are involved in the Warner Bros. arbitration. So, there are claims by Warner Bros. at entities that own library assets. Beyond those claims, and I should say in related claims to that proceeding, our broad understanding is that these special purpose vehicles own the library and, otherwise, don't owe funded or unfunded debt, aside from the ABS, of course.

So the next category, you know, of value across the enterprise, are what we globally call the derivative rights and these are independent intellectual property rights to make derivative works from the underlying copyright or the underlying project in which we own an interest. These rights were removed out of other entities in the structure, particularly, the library entities, as a product of a transaction within the last, I believe, 18 months, if memory serves.

Again, I'll flag that questions about that transaction have been, and likely, will be raised. We believe that there are justifications for it, but I certainly don't want to hide-the-ball on anything and that transaction of these rights to these assets is something, I suspect,

we're going to hear about in the case.

Next slide.

So, finally, is the independent studio business and this was a venture that the company pursued to create and produce independent works. Everything up until the creation of this studio business always depended on a partnership with a major studio, most notably, Warner Bros., but there are others: Sony, Paramount, et cetera. But this -- these entities represent the independent studio venture. The claims, the fair number of claims set forth in the debtors' top-20 list of unsecured creditors arise from this business activity.

Next slide.

So, there are, you know, there are a host of factors, despite the media's focus on the dispute with Warner Bros., which is a factor, but it is one among many. The company has suffered financial distress on account of disruptions from the COVID pandemic, the 2023 writers and directors strike, the, I should say growing prevalence of streaming companies in the entertainment industry, generally, and other general, macroeconomic headwinds. So, despite what may have been reported, this is not we are here solely because we have a dispute with Warner Bros.

The liquidity crisis, you know, really, at the end of the, in the final analysis arises from the independent

studio business' failure to really, you know, catch any altitude on the projects that it produced and made and the loss of our largest studio partner. The relationship with the largest studio partner, coupled with the inability to, or I shouldn't say, "inability," I should say that the projects just did not take off, as it were. So, ultimately, that's what set the company on a collision course with the Chapter 11.

The good news about the company's entrance into Chapter 11, and to be clear, I don't minimize at all the fact that there are hundreds of millions of dollars, you know, that have been invested in this enterprise, that there have been trade claims and other investments, some of which may not be repaid. We do enter Chapter 11 with a stalking horse purchase agreement with content partners, which I'm not -- certainly, not a show business expert, but as we understand, and our firm certainly has entertained lawyers, this is a very, very highly regarded, well-capitalized, well-financed entertainment company that owns several libraries. The headline purchase price for that library asset sale is 365 million, less some deduction and calculations. So it is a significant sum of money.

Next slide.

Here is our, just at a very high level, our proposed or projected case timeline. Of course, yesterday,

March 17th, was the petition date. We, as Mr. Mulvihill said, established April 11th for the second day hearing and entry of the bid procedures order. I will note, April 11th is the day before Passover and if Your Honor doesn't mind, I would ask on behalf of our friends in the Jewish community, that anyone can appear via Zoom, as there's not going to be meaningful argument.

THE COURT: Absolutely, yes.

MR. BERNBROCK: Thank you, Your Honor.

We do have a milestone deadline to have the final DIP order entered on or before April 21st. We've got a bid deadline of May 16th; a proposed auction, if necessary, of May 21st; a sale hearing on May 29th; and hopefully, a sale closing on or about June 17th.

Next slide.

To accomplish that, the company does require debtor-in-possession financing. The headline amount on that facility is just shy of \$13 million. Of that, there's a \$7 million new-money component, the balance of which is proposed to be a roll-up from certain bridge notes that were issued in the last several weeks.

We're not seeking to roll-up anything today; indeed, the only thing that we're seeking to do today is to draw \$500,000 on an interim basis and subject to the interim order. We -- the company simply does not have adequate cash

flow, as is shown in the budget, to fund the cases, absent this facility.

Your Honor, that really winds up my presentation and I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Benz next to walk through some of the motions. I'll call back up and talk with you about the DIP facility itself when we get to that motion in the agenda.

I will say that -- and thanks is due to the parties that I introduced and those that are on Zoom. I believe that we have a substantially consensual first day hearing and I really do want to thank the parties because, I guess, the final obsession of debtor lawyers is to get past the first day hearing. And so I think we can present Your Honor with a consensual first day calendar. Thank you, Your Honor.

Any questions?

THE COURT: With the films in which the debtors own rights, do they have any merchandising rights that go along with that?

MR. BERNBROCK: I do not know that answer, Your Honor. I'm going to look to see if we -- they do not. No, Your Honor, they do not.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BERNBROCK: Thank you, Your Honor.

I'll cede the podium to Mr. Benz.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Benz. 1 2 MR. BENZ: Good morning, Your Honor. Matthew Benz of Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & 3 Hampton, proposed counsel to the debtors and debtors-in-4 5 possession. Your Honor, I will start with the debtors' joint 6 7 administration motion, which is filed at Docket 3. 8 There are 34 entities that have filed petitions, all of whom are affiliates within the meaning of Section 101 9 10 of the Bankruptcy Code. Pursuant to the motion, the debtors 11 seek joint administration of these cases for procedural purposes only under Case Number 25-10475, which is the 12 proposed lead debtor case of Village Roadshow Entertainment 13 Group USA, Inc. The debtors view this request for relief as 14 routine and submit that it will facilitate the Court's 15 16 administration of these cases. We have shared drafts of the 17 motion with the United States Trustee prior to the petition 18 date and have incorporated any comments received. 19 Unless Your Honor has any questions, the debtors 20 request entry of the order, as attached to the motion as 21 Exhibit A. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Is there anybody who would like 23 to be heard regarding joint administration? 24 (No verbal response) 25 THE COURT: Okay. I hear no response.

2

4

8

9

It's, of course, typical first day relief that's warranted in a multi-debtor case like this one, so I'm happy to grant the motion. 3 MR. BENZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 5 Next up on the agenda is the debtors' application 6 to retain Kurtzman Carson Consultants, LLC, d/b/a Verita 7 Global, as the claims and noticing agent in these Chapter 11 cases, and that application is filed at Docket 4. The application is supported by the declaration of 10 Evan Gershbein, which is attached as Exhibit B to the 11 application. At this time, we would request that the Gershbein declaration in support of the Verita application be 12 13 moved into evidence. THE COURT: Does anybody object to the admission 14 15 of Mr. Gershbein's declaration? 16 (No verbal response) 17 THE COURT: Okay. I hear no response, and it is 18 admitted. (Gershbein Declaration received in evidence) 19 20 THE COURT: Is there anybody who would like to cross-examine Mr. Gershbein? 21 22 (No verbal response) 23 THE COURT: Okay. I hear no response. 24 MR. BENZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 25 The appointment of Verita, as claims and noticing

agent, in these Chapter 11 cases will expedite the distribution of notices, the processing of claims, facilitate other administrative aspects of these Chapter 11 cases and will relieve the Clerk of the Court of the administrative burden of processing what may be an overwhelming number of claims.

The debtors submit that Verita has the necessary qualifications and more than enough experience to serve as the claims and noticing agent in these cases and, indeed, Verita has served as claims and noticing agent in numerous large Chapter 11 cases.

The debtors have shared drafts of the application with the United States Trustee prior to the petition date and incorporated any comments received; specifically, the debtors have filed at Docket 49, an engagement agreement with Verita, which attaches a rate sheet in response to one of the United States Trustee's requests. We believe that that has resolved all outstanding concerns.

Unless Your Honor has any questions, the debtors request that Your Honor enter the order attached as Exhibit A to the application.

THE COURT: Does anybody wish to be heard regarding Verita's engagement here?

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: Okay. I hear no response.

Based upon the record before me, I do find that the relief is warranted and will grant the motion.

MR. BENZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

Next on the agenda is the debtors' PII redaction motion, which is filed at Docket 5.

Pursuant to the motion, the debtors seek authority for entry of interim and final orders authorizing the redaction of certain personally identifiable information of individuals contained within the debtors' consolidated list of creditors and certain of the filings within these Chapter 11 cases that may contain similarly personally identifiable information or otherwise sensitive information of individuals.

The debtors submit that cause exists to redact PII from the debtors' filings, due to concerns of identity theft, harassment, stalking, phishing scams, and other similar concerns.

The debtors propose to provide unredacted or to file -- excuse me -- unredacted copies of all redacted filings under seal and to provide the Court and the United States Trustee and other parties in interest, upon request, with copies of those unredacted filings. We have shared copies of the motion, drafts and motion with the United States Trustee prior to the petition dates and incorporated any comments received.

Unless Your Honor has any questions, the debtors respectfully request that Your Honor enter the interim order, attached as Exhibit A to the motion.

THE COURT: Does anybody wish to be heard regarding the PII motion?

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: Okay. I hear no response.

Based upon the evidence before me in the form of Mr. Maib's declaration, I do find that the relief requested is necessary to avoid the immediate and irreparable harm to the debtors and, therefore, I'll grant the motion on an interim basis.

MR. BENZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

Next on the agenda is the debtors' taxes motion, which appears at Docket 6.

Pursuant to the taxes motion, the debtors request entry of interim and final orders, authorizing the debtors to pay certain prepetition taxes and fees, due and owing to taxing authorities, and these taxes arise in the ordinary course. The debtors remit the taxes and fees to various foreign, federal, and state, and local government taxing authorities and these taxes and fees relate to certain property, income, sales and use, GST; i.e., goods and services taxes, that are incurred in these jurisdictions in the ordinary course of business.

The debtors believe that the relief requested is appropriate because the failure to pay such taxes and fees could subject the debtors to penalties and fees imposed by the various taxing authorities and incurring these penalties and fees could jeopardize the debtors' operations in a material manner and also jeopardize the debtors' restructuring efforts more broadly.

Pursuant to the motion, the debtors are requesting authority, but not direction, to pay \$2,700 in taxes and fees on an interim basis and \$16,700 on a final basis.

We have shared drafts of the motion with the United States Trustee prior to the petition date and incorporated any comments received. And unless Your Honor has any questions, we would respectfully request that Your Honor enter the order, the interim order attached to the taxes motion as Exhibit A.

THE COURT: Does anybody wish to be heard regarding the taxes motion?

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: Okay. I hear no response.

Based upon the evidence before me in the form of Mr. Maib's declaration, I do find that any irreparable harm would come to the debtors if I did not grant this relief on an interim basis. The debtor simply needs to pay its taxes and avoid the sorts of consequences that you described. I'd

1 also note that the amounts at stake here are minimal, but the 2 consequences of not paying those amounts could be quite upsized. So, I'm certainly satisfied that the debtors have 3 shown why it's appropriate and I would grant the motion on an 4 5 interim basis. 6 MR. BENZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 I will now cede the podium to my colleague, Ms. Paddock. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. Welcome, Ms. Paddock. 10 MS. PADDOCK: Thank you. Good morning, Your 11 12 Honor. 13 For the record, Alyssa Paddock, Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, proposed counsel to Village Roadshow 14 15 Entertainment Group USA and its affiliated debtors. 16 Your Honor, first, I will turn to the debtors' 17 cash management motion, which is Agenda 7 and filed at 18 Docket 7. 19 This motion has been previewed with the U.S. 20 Trustee and last night we received a couple comments to add 21 clarifying language to the proposed interim order from Alcon 22 and Warner Bros.; both of those comments have been 23 incorporated and, again, shown to the U.S. Trustee. 24 We actually have a new redline that's fresher than

the one we sent to the Court this morning, if I could bring

it up to you.

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MS. PADDOCK: May I approach?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

Thank you, Ms. Paddock.

MS. PADDOCK: Your Honor, this motion seeks authority for the debtors to continue operating their existing cash management system in the ordinary course, honor prepetition obligations relating to bank fees, and to continue to honor intercompany transactions in an ordinary course, as well as seek administrative expense priority for post-petition intercompany claims.

The debtors' cash management system, like most, is designed to collect, transfer, and disburse funds through the debtors' operations and to accurately record such collections, transfers, and disbursements. Continued use of this cash management system is critical to support the debtors' current operations, and I can provide Your Honor with a quick overview of the schematic attached to the motion as Exhibit D.

THE COURT: Certainly.

MS. PADDOCK: Your Honor, as you will see here, while the debtors technically have 21 bank accounts, they only operate and control 6. The bottom 14 accounts are all restricted and operate at the direction of the ABS trustee

and pursuant to various transaction agreements.

those accounts on a quarterly basis for a servicing fee that's calculated every quarter and differs from quarter to quarter. The debtors do not have direct control of those accounts and, similarly, the siloed accounts to the left of the page, is more of a pass-through account due to a cash flow arrangement based on a transaction for the sale of distribution proceeds with Alcon. That relates to one of the comments to the order. So the debtors do not operate that account; it's controlled by Alcon employees and they also do not have a right to any of the proceeds within that account.

So, the main accounts, and the only accounts they operate, are the six in the middle; the four, the U.S. operating accounts, the top one being the main operating account where they disburse checks and issue payments appeared receive payments, generally. Right below it is payroll, which is swept daily. And over on the right side are the two Australian accounts; those cover the processing fees and operation expenses for the Australian employees. We have six there, which I'll get to next. Generally, those amounts are covered by intercompany transactions from the main U.S. operating account to Australia and then converting that middle one and then paid out of the second one. Those accounts can, at times, bring in cash. It's much more rare,

but they are connected to various payables, based on all transactions.

Your Honor, the debtors submit that all these accounts in the U.S. are authorized depositories in accordance with the UST Guidelines. The Australian accounts are international or not [sic], but the debtors submit that they are in substantial compliance with 345(b). They are maintained at banks that are well-capitalized and insured, in accordance with Australian law.

However, though, the debtors -- with those two accounts (indiscernible), the debtors are -- are seeking interim suspension of the requirements of Section 345(b) for an initial period of 45 days, as set forth in the motion, and will continue to work with the U.S. Trustee going forward.

So, with all that background, as set forth in the motion, the debtors are seeking authority to continue to engage in routine intercompany transactions and honor intercompany claims in the ordinary course. The debtors maintain all of their records of their transactions and record them as receivables and payables. And, importantly, the debtors will not be transferring any amounts to non-debtor affiliates during these cases.

The debtors are also seeking administrative expense priority for intercompany claims post-petition.

There's a bit of clarifying language regarding that in the

proposed order, which I can walk through at the end, that has also been agreed to with the U.S. Trustee.

Next, the debtors are seeking to pay prepetition bank fees, which are, of course, necessary in order to maintain these bank accounts. They accrue about a thousand dollars in bank fees per month, which is paid quarterly.

Just since January 1st through the petition date, there's about \$2,670 outstanding on account of prepetition bank fees that need paid and will become due on March 31st.

Finally, from a substantive standpoint, the debtors are seeking to utilize their current business forms, as changing forms would be unnecessarily and dutily burdensome and expensive for the estate. All of the requests for relief in this motion, Your Honor, is standard with (indiscernible) in this court and the debtors submit that any disruption to the current cash management system would substantially diminish and impair the debtors' efforts in these Chapter 11 cases.

As set forth in the motion, Bankruptcy Rule 6003 is implied and the relief requested, the debtors believe is integral to the operations and without it, the debtors would suffer immediate and irreparable harm to their estates.

If Your Honor would like, I can walk through the changes in the order.

THE COURT: Right. It looks like paragraph 8, you

have the language that you just mentioned about the ordinary 1 2 course, intercompany claims. MS. PADDOCK: Yep, and that was agreed to with 3 Warner Bros. and the U.S. Trustee. 4 5 And then paragraph 9 just adds the clarifying 6 language from Alcon, with respect to those accounts that the 7 debtors have, but do not operate. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MS. PADDOCK: So, unless there's any other 10 questions, I would request entry of the interim order, as previewed in the redline, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. Let me first ask if there's anyone in the courtroom who would like to be heard regarding 13 14 the cash management motion? 15 Mr. Harvey, good morning. MR. HARVEY: Good morning, Your Honor. 16 17 And for the record, Matthew Harvey from Morris, 18 Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell. 19 I rise to simply thank the debtors for resolving 20 this comment with us and also to introduce my co-counsel, Mr. 21 Stephen Warren from O'Melveny & Myers; we represent, 22 together, Warner Bros. Entertainment, Inc. and certain of its 23 affiliates. And I know Mr. Warren wanted -- had a few comments 24

he wanted to provide the Court and whether it's appropriate

1 to do that now or in connection with the DIP, I just wanted 2 to introduce him and offer that to Your Honor now. THE COURT: Okay. I'm happy to hear from 3 4 Mr. Warren now. 5 MR. HARVEY: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Harvey. 7 Mr. Warren, good morning. 8 MR. WARREN: Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you 9 very much. 10 Stephen Warren of O'Melveny & Myers, appearing on behalf of Warner Bros. Entertainment, Inc. and its 11 affiliates. I'll refer to those as "Warner." Also appearing 12 remotely with me are Scott Drake and Emma Jones of 13 O'Melveny & Myers. 14 15 I want to thank the Court, initially, for allowing us to appear remotely. I'm in California and my colleagues 16 17 are in Texas. We'd be there if we physically could have, so 18 I appreciate the kindness that Your Honor has shown us in 19 allowing us to appear remotely. 20 I will probably save most of my comments, perhaps, 21 for when we get to the DIP. That's probably the meatier 22 section, so, perhaps, we can talk again, then. 23 I do want to thanks the debtors for adding language here and clarifying that the intercompany transfers 24

will only be ordinary course and will be subject to Rules in

1 terms of value being received to the estate. 2 So, thank you very much for that clarification and we'll be back at the DIP. Thank you, Your Honor. 3 4 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Warren. 5 Is there anybody else who would like to be heard regarding the cash management motion? 6 7 (No verbal response) 8 THE COURT: Okay. I hear nobody in the courtroom. 9 Mr. Rubinstein, good morning. 10 MR. RUBINSTEIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Vadim Rubinstein of Loeb & Loeb, counsel to Alcon 11 Entertainment and its affiliated companies, including 12 13 (indiscernible) Pictures. First, Your Honor, thank you, again, for allowing 14 15 me to appear remotely at the hearing on short notice; it's 16 greatly appreciated. 17 THE COURT: Certainly. 18 MR. RUBINSTEIN: I want to introduce my co-19 counsel, Ms. Kimberly Brown from Landis Rath & Cobb, who is 20 in the courtroom this morning, and she's been directing with 21 the debtors in my stead. 22 I will also save some comments for the DIP order. 23 For purposes of this particular motion, I will say, first, as

it relates to the debtors, we do question whether the entity

VREG Wonka IP Global LLC is before Your Honor and should be

24

1 before Your Honor as a debtor under the Bankruptcy Code. 2 are considering that issue. But the debtors have been gracious in their 3 negotiations regarding the cash management order and they 4 5 certainly have relieved some of our concerns and we thank the 6 debtors for that and for including the language in the first 7 day order and we appreciate that. 8 With respect to the other matters in the case, I will just leave it for now and I'll pick it up at the DIP. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. MR. RUBINSTEIN: And Your Honor (indiscernible) 11 12 the DIP. 13 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Rubinstein. Is there anybody else who would like to be heard 14 15 regarding cash management? 16 (No verbal response) 17 THE COURT: Okay. I hear no response. 18 Based on the evidence before me in the form of 19 Mr. Maib's declaration and finding the routine, that this is 20 relief that's routinely requested in a first day and if I did 21 not enter this order, immediate and irreparable harm would 22 come to the debtors and, therefore, I'm happy to grant the 23 motion on an interim basis.

MS. PADDOCK: Thank you, Your Honor.

Next up, we will turn to the wages motion, which

24

is Agenda 8 and filed at Docket 8.

This motion, too, has been previewed with the U.S. Trustee and, thankfully, no comments were received, so we are seeking relief of Your Honor to enter the interim order, as filed.

Your Honor, as you've likely seen in the first day declaration and in this motion, the debtors have really tapered their workforce significantly over the last several months as part of cost-cutting measures and the result of that is the employees that the debtors do have remaining are an absolutely critical workforce. And each employee is vital to the company's operations to continue through these Chapter 11 cases.

The debtors workforce consists of five U.S. employees, two executives and three administrative professionals, and six employees in Australia, all of which who are members of the debtors' accounting team.

Like almost every other Chapter 11 case and even more so here, the debtors' employees are essential to their operation. In this particular case, these employees have a history with the company, have been integral to its business for many years, and like all employees, rely on this employment for, themselves, and their families. During these cases, it is imperative that the debtors retain these employees in order to continue uninterrupted operations

through these cases and through the proposed sale of the debtors' assets.

I can walk Your Honor through a few of the main points, as set forth in the motion. The debtors offer a standard suite of employee benefits and as you'll see in the motion, the amount that the debtors are seeking to pay for outstanding prepetition amounts is actually quite low. This is on account of a payroll that went out on Friday the 14th, so the only amount of wages that have accrued since are over the weekend.

I do want to bring Your Honor's attention to one thing in the chart that is in the motion. The chart conflicts with the body of the motion a little bit and does not request amounts for reimbursable expenses, which are things like business expenses, credit card payments.

As you'll see in the motion, Your Honor, we are seeking a thousand dollars in that bucket on an interim and final basis to pay any possible outstanding prepetition reimbursable expenses that are owed to the employees. As Your Honor will see, the kind of main buckets that have outstanding amounts are the employee leave benefits which are generally comprised of accruing PTO in accordance with company policy, both in the U.S. and Australia.

And the really large amount, comparatively, requested through this motion is what is called the

"Australian employee termination pay" bucket. This is an account of two different concepts that are required under statutory law in Australia, which is the Australia employee termination pay and then the redundancy pay. Those are both required under Australian law.

And I think it is important to note here that while we are seeking authority, but not direction, to pay this on an interim basis, we do not currently anticipate a cash payment will go out. This is an amount that has accrued prepetition and it could become due at any time and that is why we are seeking Your Honor's authority to pay it at any time when it becomes due in accordance with Australian law.

I would, again, note that Rule 6003 is implicated and for the reasons set forth in the motion and stated here, the ability to pay the employees that we do have and maintain their benefit programs through these Chapter 11 cases is absolutely critical to prevent irreparable harm.

Unless Your Honor has any questions, I would request Your Honor enter the interim order, as attached to the motion.

THE COURT: Is there anybody who would like to be heard regarding the wage motion?

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: Okay. I hear no response.

Based upon the evidence before me in the form of

1 Mr. Maib's declaration, I do find that immediate and 2 irreparable harm would come to the debtors if I did not grant this relief. It's unthinkable that the employees should have 3 to continue to work while there's uncertainty about whether 4 5 they can even be paid timely for the work that they've 6 performed for the debtors prepetition and receive the 7 benefits that they count on and they bargained for in connection with their employment. So, I'm happy to grant 8 this motion on an interim basis. 9 10 MS. PADDOCK: Thank you very much, Your Honor. And I will now cede the podium back to Justin 11 Bernbrock. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 13 Mr. Bernbrock? 14 15 MR. BERNBROCK: Thank you, Your Honor. Bear with me one moment, please. 16 17 (Pause) 18 MR. BERNBROCK: Again, for the record, Your Honor, 19 Justin Bernbrock of Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, 20 proposed counsel to the debtors and debtors-in-possession. 21 Your Honor, the final item on today's agenda is 22 Item 9, Docket 9, the debtors' motion for authorization to 23 enter into and borrow under the proposed debtor-in-possession financing facility. Your Honor, as is common in cases of 24 25 this type, the pleadings set forth the basis for the relief

requested. We also have the evidentiary support of the declarations provided by Mr. Maib and Mr. Koutsonicolis from SOLIC Capital.

I want to highlight a couple of headlined components, just to reiterate from the overview presentation that I gave. The facility size is just shy of \$13 million, of which \$7 million is proposed to be new-money financing.

And then there's a proposed roll-up component of \$5,786,105 and we are proposing to roll that up pari passu with the DIP liens.

There's a standard carve-out in the proposed DIP order. In other packages, or I'd say an are broader package of components, afforded for the benefit of the DIP lenders and certain other parties, most notably, adequate protection for certain prepetition secured parties, the ABS trustee and their counsel, as well as the senior, secured noteholders, as well.

I want to flag what I think is probably one of the more controversial components of the proposed financing, which is the prepetition financing is in separate silos and the chief reason for that is that the ABS silo, where substantially all of the library asset value sits, has highly restrictive covenants and components in both, the base indenture and amendments and supplements thereto, as well as any organizational documents restrict the incurrence of debt

at those entities.

The proposed debtor-in-possession financing would be at all entities throughout the debtors' structure. The exception or the limitation is that at the ABS entities, the DIP would go and subordinate to the ABS collateral and liens and so on. Everywhere else in the structure is proposed to be superseding or first priority, but it is different than what is prepetition.

We have done some research on this point. I think that the leading case is, In re Vanguard Diversified, 31 B.R. 364, which comes from the Eastern District of New York; I think a Judge Duberstein decision, if I have my facts right. There was a four-factor test established by that Court and those factors are that the Court should consider whether, absent the proposed financing, the debtors' business operations will not survive; two, the debtor is unable to obtain alternative financing on acceptable terms; three, the proposed lender will not accede to less-preferential terms; and, four, the proposed financing is in the best interests of the general creditor body.

We believe that we satisfy, and we set out more fully in the papers how we satisfy those factors. It's plain from the evidence in Mr. Maib's declaration that the debtors do have a cash need to operate and, ultimately, get to a consummation of the library sale.

You know, what is at least interesting to note is the proposed library sale, if we just take the three-hundred-and-sixty-five-million-dollar number and we less the ABS obligation, which are approximately \$223 million, we have a net result of \$142 million. And then the DIP would be immediately junior to that ABS obligation.

So, as those ABS entities, where we believe the only material, potential creditor is Warner Bros., we have excess proceeds of approximately \$140 million or \$130 million if you were to assume that the DIP were to be fully funded and repaid. The Warner Bros. claim, we believe, at present, is unliquidated and there are certain confidentiality provisions that govern what we can say about that particular arbitration proceeding, but there are significant excess proceeds and, I'm sorry, and certainly not representing that Warner Bros. believes that those are sufficient to satisfy its claim or that they're insufficient or that the debtors assert otherwise. The point is, that is a significant sum of money that creates a cushion at those ABS entities, again, where no other material unsecured creditors sit.

The <u>Vanguard</u> decision, Your Honor, just to button that up, was recognized by Judge Stickles in this court, in the <u>In re Blink Holdings</u> case, as well as the <u>In re Mondee</u>

<u>Holdings</u> case, and I believe those are cited in our papers; if not, we have the case numbers that we can provide.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BERNBROCK: So, I do want to talk about a couple of other components here. With respect to our friend, Mr. Rubinstein and our friends at Alcon, the broader arrangement or business deal and transaction between the parties is that we, on a prepetition basis, sold to Alcon, the stream of payments in connection with the Wonka film -
THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BERNBROCK: -- not with Mr. Wilder. This is the new one with the Chalamet fella.

The way that that operates or at least the way that the stream of cash operates is that the money comes into a debtor, effectively, a lockbox account. It is then automatically, and without any action by the debtors, swept and paid to Alcon.

Some of the language that we have put into the proposed DIP order addresses that any liens granted in connection with the DIP order and the superpriority administrative claims, et cetera, do not and shall not encumber that which the debtors don't own. And I think it's fair to say that's a very reasonable ask by Mr. Rubinstein and we're happy to incorporate it, and it accords with our understanding of the law.

And in a moment I'll hand up a proposed order. We did receive a proposed paragraph from the Warner Bros.

entities and claimants. And let me just say to each of Mr.

Rubinstein and Mr. Warren, we're very, very grateful for your reasonableness, your willingness to work with us, and we hope that it spells good vibes, I guess, for the future, and -- because we may have to call upon those.

The point, I think, of the Warner Bros. language, and it will and it shall speak for itself, and of course Mr. Warren will speak to it as well, it is to preserve the status quo as between the parties. There is permission to make the initial funding; however, to the extent that it is subsequently determined by this Court or other court of competent jurisdiction that there are infirmities or other limitations with respect to what's proposed in connection with this facility, there will be another opportunity, particularly in connection with the final order, to revisit that. And certainly our sincere hope and my commitment to Mr. Warren, and his colleagues and his client, is that the debtors are prepared to do whatever possible to resolve that in advance of that final order hearing.

Mr. Ahdoot, my dear, dear friend, it warms my heart to see him on the Zoom screen, he represents several of the Guilds. So this is the Screen Actors Guild of American, the Writers Guild of America, as well as the Directors Guild of America, and I'll say other because I know that there are other related union types in connection with the companies.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So these creative people and members of these Guilds, as part of their agreements to participate in motion pictures and television and other entertainment projects, have very robust and quite notable rights and claims, some of which become secured claims at various entities, and they attach to certain projects. We, you know, in the very short time between the petition date and this hearing have not had, and it would be unfair to Mr. Ahdoot to say that we have had nearly enough time to go through and make sure in each and every instance whether there's a valid lien claim or whether amounts are due and owing. My representation to Mr. Ahdoot when we spoke yesterday was that we will work between now and the final order to determine what those claims are, if any, and treat them as the Bankruptcy Code requires, whether that's adequate protection payments, whether that's through additional lien -- whatever the law provides, they will get. I think, as I understand some email traffic that's

I think, as I understand some email traffic that's been going on during the hearing, the best way that we might address this is to have a paragraph that mirrors, at least in many respects, the paragraph supplied by Warner Bros. for Mr. Ahdoot's clients as well.

Lastly, we are doing something or at least proposing to do something novel with respect to this motion. We have a proposed transaction support agreement that was affixed to the motion. And this is -- I will claim credit if

it goes badly; if it goes well, it was my partner's idea —
the idea here is we have a facility — we have a
securitization facility where, while we know the holders and
we know who the trustee is, were we to have had substantive
engagement with those holders in a very limited prepetition
window, we would have infected them with material nonpublic
information, restricting their ability to trade. And so,
after having many discussions with my new friend Mr. Galvan
at the Barnes & Thornburg firm, we ultimately concluded that
it would be best to wait until the petition date, the cases
had been filed, to engage with the holders under that ABS
facility.

That of course puts Mr. Gavant and his client,
U.S. Bank, in an uncomfortable position as an indenture
trustee who knows something and is not able to engage with
its holders, while at the same time, very graciously, seeking
to help the debtors in what we're trying to accomplish with
respect to these bankruptcy cases generally. The farthest -and to his credit, the farthest that I could push Mr. Gavant
was that we would agree to a form of a transaction support
agreement, very similar to a restructuring support agreement,
whereby we have made various commitments to the ABS trustee
and the holders thereunder, they have made -- are proposing
to make commitments to the debtors. The trustee cannot,
shall not, will not sign that document unless and until 50.1

percent of the holders under that facility give the direction for the trustee to do so.

And, again, I really wanted to thank Mr. Gavant because there could have been many other reactions to this idea of attaching a proposed, agreed-as-to-form agreement, but this is -- it's unique here and critical, and I would say that the relief we're requesting could, if denied, give rise to immediate and irreparable harm because -- and I'll give a specific example in a second -- there are components of the indenture that prefer to operate automatically without any further action by the trustee, the most notable example is the debtors act as servicer under the ABS facility, and this is largely the operations conducted in Australia. So, in a world where we don't have the benefits and protections of this proposed transaction support agreement, we may have to scramble to find a replacement servicer to step in and do the collection of money in connection with that facility.

There are a number of components, I won't go into all of them, but the overarching theme of what we're trying to accomplish with that transaction support agreement is that, so long as we hold good on our end of the bargain, which is the first \$223 million and then some that come from our sale of their collateral we're going to pay to them, retire that facility in full indefeasibly, and in the meantime we ask them to sort of ride along with us and not

oppose that which we are trying to do.

will note for -- because I don't want it to be not noted that the United States Trustee's Office I think does have some concern with that document and our request that it be -- the debtors be authorized, but not directed, to enter into that if, and only if, the ABS noteholders give the direction to U.S. Bank. What we want to have the ability to do is then countersign that document immediately. It's a post-petition agreement outside the ordinary course of business; we have cited Section 363 to seek that relief.

I've got a -- at least whatever the current draft of the order was that -- when we clicked print, but before I tick through that, perhaps, Your Honor -- well, first let me ask, does Your Honor have any questions about the debtors' motion and the relief requested?

THE COURT: No, I think I understand what you're trying to do.

MR. BERNBROCK: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BERNBROCK: And then I would propose, subject to Your Honor's concurrence, perhaps Mr. Warren, Mr. Rubinstein, Mr. Ahdoot, if they want to speak now, and then I

24 can go into the order itself.

THE COURT: Yeah, let me first ask if there's

anyone in the courtroom who would like to be heard regarding the DIP motion.

Ms. Sierra-Fox. Good morning.

MS. SIERRA-FOX: Good morning, Your Honor, Rosa Sierra-Fox on behalf of the U.S. Trustee.

Your Honor, I think our objection is simple. I think, generally, we don't believe — the U.S. Trustee does not believe that entry into the transaction support agreement is necessary under Rule 6003 to avoid immediate and irreparable harm, and I can explain why we believe that. But, Your Honor, in the alternative, I think another potentially satisfactory way to resolve this, if Your Honor is inclined to allow the debtors that authority on a first day basis, is to supplement the record as to the necessity for this relief.

I think Mr. Bernbrock's introduction and argument was certainly helpful, but I do think that as far as evidence on the record on this point, the best I think that's been addressed here is the chief restructuring officer's declaration at about paragraph 21. Perhaps there's more of a proffer that the debtors can offer so this Court and the public can be rest assured that it is -- you know, there is a potential here for immediate and irreparable harm if the transaction support agreement, the debtors are not authorized to enter into that once the trustee has the authority from

the requisite noteholders.

But, Your Honor, looking at the substance of the transaction agreement, I think -- and I discussed this with debtors' counsel -- I see it as an agreement that agrees to preserve the status quo in a certain sense, the parties continue to act how they were acting under the respective agreements; however, I do see potential implications for Rule 6003. The debtors are incurring a post-petition indemnification obligation, that's Section 6-4 of the transaction support agreement. The issue about the servicer also implicates a potential assumption or of an executory contract and, like I said, Your Honor, Rule -- and as I referenced, Rule 6003 does not allow the debtor to incur those types of obligations within the first 21 days of the case unless it's immediate -- necessary to avoid immediate and irreparable harm.

And, Your Honor, if the parties have agreed, and here meaning the ABS trustee and the debtors have agreed to abide by a certain set of conduct up through the interim hearing, I think the parties are certainly going to be well served by proceeding in that way, and they can certainly continue to act in that way up until the final hearing when, hopefully, this agreement and -- notice of this motion and this agreement has gone out on notice as required by the rules.

Simply put, Your Honor, I don't know -- I guess what I don't know, and parties don't know what they don't know, so I'm not sure if this implicates the rights of other parties that have yet to appear, and, even if those parties have appeared, whether they've had enough time to fully understand the implications of entering -- the debtor having authority to enter into this transaction support agreement.

So for those reasons, Your Honor, we don't believe -- the U.S. Trustee does not believe that the debtors should be authorized to do that, at least on an interim basis, and that's addressed -- the relevant part of the order that addresses this, Your Honor, is paragraph 24. So, to the extent there are -- Your Honor is inclined to agree with the U.S. Trustee in any way, I believe that's where we'd need to make changes to the order.

And, Your Honor, like I previewed at the outset, alternatively perhaps, if Your Honor is inclined to allow the debtors to enter into this agreement on an interim basis, perhaps the parties and the debtors can do -- offer some further, more robust evidentiary support as to what harm would result if they don't have this support agreement.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you so much, Ms. Sierra-Fox.

Yes, Mr. Gavant, welcome.

MR. GAVANT: Thank you, Your Honor. Aaron Gavant from Barnes & Thornburg on behalf of the ABS trustee, and I'm here with my colleague Amy Tryon also --

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. GAVANT: -- from the Delaware office.

I was going to take the opportunity to introduce who my client is, Mr. Bernbrock did a phenomenal job, but obviously we are a primary stakeholder in this case and certainly in one of the silos that we've been discussing. We are just the trustee -- I don't put just -- I know we have an important role, but as has been explained we are the legal title holder of the interests here and we want to make sure we're acting for the beneficial interest holders, who we have not yet had the opportunity to speak to.

We do think the proposed sale, which is not up before Your Honor today, of the library assets, is sort of the key component of the case, and so we have tried to work cooperatively with the debtors. To repeat what was said in the papers and what has been said from the podium today, the debtors have been forthright with us. We believe we have been engaged in good faith negotiations. We understand what they're trying to do with the DIP, we understand what they're trying to do with the sale, and it's really just due to timing that we have not yet been able to sign the transaction support agreement that is before Your Honor today. We've

worked on a structure that we think could get there. Would we in other circumstances potentially have been able to sign that prepetition? Yes. May we be -- will we potentially be in a situation to sign that shortly? Also potentially yes, also potentially no, we don't know yet. Subject to all, we filed a reservation of rights on these points. We don't know what our holders will say, but all of that is to say that we think there's real value for the debtors, obviously -- and it's their case to make, but in keeping this case moving, and we're trying to be a helpful partner in that.

And so, again, we have to speak to our holders, but we do think there is value in giving the debtors the authority to enter that agreement today, even if not the direction. But I also wanted to answer any questions Your Honor might have on that structure.

THE COURT: I think it creates an interesting issue, right? If you're not yet authorized to enter into the agreement, the debtor is asking me to approve something without it actually being, I guess for want of a better term, ripe to be adjudicated. You may get there, you may not; you may get there on different terms.

So, if there is no actual agreement among the parties to enter into this transaction, then should I be approving it at all right now?

MR. GAVANT: So, I understand what Your Honor is

saying. I might take some issue with saying that we're not willing to enter into the agreement. There is one -- there are two parties --

THE COURT: No, not that you're not willing, it's just that you're not there.

MR. GAVANT: Correct.

THE COURT: I think the point that you made, and I read your written submission as well, is that you need to talk to the holders. So you're kind of in an in-between position right now. You know what you're recommending to them, I suppose, but you don't know yet if you have the consent of the client to do it.

MR. GAVANT: And that's right. To speak really just in practical terms, rather than legal terms, this is probably the most efficient way to do it. If holders do support this agreement, we will be in a position to move quickly. And I know there's time pressures here and so, again, we're trying to be good partners.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. GAVANT: And so, yes, to your point, Your Honor, if we get approval on this form, which the trustee is willing to sign, this is the best way to move quickly, but I confirm that we do not yet know how holders will react.

THE COURT: Understood. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Gavant --

1 MR. GAVANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- I appreciate it.

Is there anybody else in the courtroom who would like to be heard?

(No verbal response)

THE COURT: Okay. Let me start with Mr. Warren, please.

MR. WARREN: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

Again, Steven Warren, O'Melveny & Myers, on behalf of Warner

Bros.

I always like to start with good news, and the good news is I can confirm what Mr. Bernbrock said, we've made tremendous progress in terms of the language that would reserve Warner's rights with respect to the DIP, the adequate protection, the liens, the whole suite of rights that are covered in that motion. I think we may be down to a word or two, and we understand there will be some discussion after the hearing just to resolve those last little cleanup items. But the gist of it is that all of Warner's objections that it would otherwise be presenting today can be heard at the final and all preserved with respect to the liens and the adequate protection.

We do consent to the \$500,000 going out, no point battling over that sum of money given the numbers here otherwise in terms of claims, but there are protections for

our rights under contract and (indiscernible) granted, and rights with contracts with us are subject to those contract rights, and the rights with respect to IP are subject to -- they don't alter, they don't supersede any of our IP rights. And so we've (indiscernible) ourselves I think to another day.

And, in some circumstances, I'd like now just to sit down -- or, I guess, turn my mic off, but with the Court's indulgence, I'd like to spend a little bit of time addressing points that Mr. Bernbrock raised in his initial presentation, in part, table setting. And I always think it's odd when parties reserve rights and then don't explain at all what it is that they're preserving and why it's relevant, and I'd like to, with the Court's indulgence, spend a couple of minutes doing that.

Your Honor, the parties' relationship, covered to some extent by the Maib declaration, but it really goes back to 1998 and it covers a huge suite, I think it's over 90 theatrical films that you would recognize: The Matrix, Oceans 11, Sherlock Holmes. Warner is the creative spark in all of these franchises, it has the exclusive right to create the content, decide whether a film will be produced, and what the film will be and what its contents will be, that's exclusively Warner, but Village has -- as had under the parties' agreement, has a financial interest. It can

finance, co-finance the pictures and, if it does, it gets a participation, it shares the revenue stream.

And so when we hear about the library assets, we're talking about those films, they've already been produced, there's money coming in, and it's getting split, that's the language. But there's also a right in certain circumstances for derivative assets or new motion pictures. If Warner, with respect to these existing franchises, decides to create a new film, in that event, then Village can (indiscernible) finance.

At the beginning of our relationship, Your Honor, Village was a failing (indiscernible) company, it's since, you know, owned by a high-powered private equity firm, and you heard a decision was made to fundamentally alter their business model. They went from financing motion pictures created by others to creating their own content, and they've candidly admitted that that effort resulted in failure. Unfortunately, from our perspective, Your Honor, when that failed, Village failed to live up to its contractual obligations with respect to co-financing.

The dispute between the parties grows out of the Matrix franchise, Matrix Resurrections. That was a cofinancing arrangement and understood that Village had committed to co-finance. Based on that reliance on that commitment, Warner spent \$200 million to produce the film,

\$100 million to market it, and then Village did not step forward and provide co-financing. That's led to a years-long arbitration that has gone on for quite a bit.

I know there were some redacted sections, it is a confidential arbitration, and so some items can only be shared with the Court through redactions in camera and clearing the court, or however one might do that, but there's some things I can share with you. The first thing is we very much contest, and you won't be surprised to hear, some of the characterizations in the redacted section regarding what happened during the arbitration.

Now, I can share some other facts with you because they're not confidential, they've either been disclosed or we have the right to do so. Liability has already been determined, the arbitrators have already decided that Village breached its obligations with respect to the Matrix preliminary injunction, that's done, all that's left is to determine the damages. And, again, with respect to the public record I can tell you Warner took the position at the inception of the dispute that it was owed approximately \$100 million, maybe even a bit more, and that number hasn't gone down. So that, I think, sets kind of the goal posts of the dispute.

I really did appreciate the presentation and the candor to the Court that there's some real concerns about

transactions that took place here. After Warner Bros. succeeded in establishing liability in the arbitration, the derivative assets were moved out of the entities that were obligors — are obligors of Warner Bros. and the newlycreated special purpose entities for a dollar, for a dollar apiece. These are rights that Village had taken the position are worth quite a lot of money and, for a dollar, they transferred them out, and then we subsequently found out that those new entities guaranteed and pledged those derivative rights which could not have been pledged under the agreements with Warner up to the parent's debt. And we've taken the position that the transactions were a fraudulent transfer, we've taken the position that the pledges were fraudulent, intentional or constructively fraudulent transfers, and Mr. Bernbrock has flagged that for you.

With respect to the assets, Your Honor, if I could just spend a moment. The schematic that was provided was really very helpful to us, I'm sure it was to the Court too. The last page of the Maib declaration is that schematic showing kind of broad outline of the debtors, it's also I think at paragraph 17 of that declaration. If you look at the library assets, that's what's being sold here, over \$300 million, if you look over on the right lower section of the schematic, you see those entities, there are four entities that have red boxes around them, those are the ones that

Warner has sued or is pursuing in the arbitration that they own the library rights, the income stream that comes in from the films. And you'll see there's -- you know, there's no -- that the silo, I think as Mr. Bernbrock called it, of the notes, senior notes, they're not there, there's no green. They don't have claims, they don't have blues there.

But it's important because under the DIP motion (indiscernible) with financing that would invade those assets that are not subject to the (indiscernible) claims, there would be a rollup of their prepetition debt for which those parties are obligated, and there would be adequate protection for what is, in our view, an equity interest, right, because ultimately what those noteholders have is a claim on the equity of the equity of the equity of those, and we don't think you can bootstrap equity into a superpriority claim by adequate protection and going ahead of the creditors.

And the derivative rights we already talked about, you see that in the schematic, those green entities down at (indiscernible) those were the beneficiaries of the (indiscernible) transfers. Warner has rights under its agreements. Again, we think they prevented those transactions, we think applicable law prevented those transactions. And there are a handful of things -- you know, I'm kind of winding up here, Your Honor -- that concern us a lot. It's the validation of the liens and transfers that

took place with those shell entities of the derivative rights, there's a challenge period, but we're the only parties who were really hurt by this, we would say we were the target. There may be no other creditor that was as potentially injured as we were because value has escaped from entities that are obligated to us, but they're also -- they are also rights related to our content, so we may be the ones who are really most concerned about that.

Also, the grant of the rights with respect to the library assets, again, we're talking about the grants being given by the rollup and protection of entities that aren't claimants presently (indiscernible) that's a concern (indiscernible). It also grants the noteholders proceeds — or I should say the DIP lenders, but sort of noteholders proceeds of avoidance actions that, as we said, our concern is they may be the target of those avoidance actions, that doesn't seem to favor it.

There are many other concerns, those are the most pressing I wanted to raise with the Court and, hopefully, we'll be able to make progress, I don't know whether we'll be able to get all the way there. These are serious concerns and they go to a number of different parts of this proposal, but we're open to having those conversations. We're cheered by the fact that we got through today. This may be the first consensual thing amongst the parties that's happened, you

know, since -- with respect to the arbitration and these disputes for some time, and we're open to having further conversations.

The last little footnote, Your Honor -- and I know this is more of a second day issue, but we do want to make sure with respect to the sale process there's sufficient time to really analyze this and think about it. We don't think this is a melting ice cube. The debtor is a holding company, it has 11 employees. We're going to want to think about the timing to make sure that we understand all the transactions, where the money is going, is it going to be protected and preserved for the creditors who have claims directly at the level where the assets are.

With that, Your Honor, I'll hold myself open to questions, and thank you very much for your patience.

THE COURT: Thank you very much for the comments, Mr. Warren, I appreciate that helpful background.

Let me hear from Mr. Rubinstein, please.

MR. RUBINSTEIN: Good morning again, Your Honor, Vadim Rubinstein of Loeb & Loeb, counsel to Alcon Entertainment and its affiliates.

First, I wanted to echo what Mr. Warren has indicated regarding the debtors' cooperation with the DIP order, they have been quite cooperative and we thank the debtors in that regard, but in terms of -- I only rise for

the one issue of setting the stage and issues that Alcon may 1 2 be bring to Your Honor's attention down the road, one of which does relate to the sale process that Mr. Warren has 3 just discussed with you, in that Alcon has always viewed 4 5 itself as one of the likely parties that would be interested 6 in the purchase of the debtors' assets. And while the 7 debtors may have a different view of things, it is certainly Alcon's belief that it was not afforded the opportunity to make a bid in this process despite its efforts leading up to 9 10 this filing.

And so you will be hearing about this, I suspect, down the road, but I just wanted the Court to be aware of the fact that this shouldn't be a surprise, Alcon is an interested party here and Alcon expects to be heard with respect to the bid procedures motion down the road.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Rubinstein.

Mr. Ahdoot, good morning. Welcome.

MR. AHDOOT: Good morning, Your Honor. It's nice to see you again.

THE COURT: Nice to see you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. AHDOOT: David Ahdoot, Bush Gottlieb, on behalf of the entertainment guilds.

Your Honor, I rise very briefly, primarily to give thanks first to the Court for allowing us to appear by Zoom today, as well as on April 11th. I am in Los Angeles and it

was very much appreciated. My colleague Susan Kaufman is in 1 2 the courtroom today as well. THE COURT: Yes, she is. 3 MR. AHDOOT: Mr. Bernbrock accurately presented 4 5 the situation with the Guilds. We want to sort of endorse 6 his commentary with respect to the fact that our interests in 7 cash collateral as they relate to the DIP have not really been fully vetted. We proposed some language just this morning via email during this hearing which we presume will 9 be accepted, but we still need to sort of finalize that, and 10 assuming that it is accepted or something similar is 11 accepted, the Guilds are comfortable with moving forward. 12 13 I guess the only other point I have is that I'm also pleased to be able to reaffirm my friendship with Mr. 14 15 Bernbrock on the record. Since he opened that door, I 16 thought I might as well as validate his comments. 17 Other than that, Your Honor, again, thank you for 18 taking the time and it's much appreciated. 19 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ahdoot. 20 Is there anybody else who would like to be heard 21 concerning the DIP? 22 Mr. Samis. 23 MR. SAMIS: Good morning, Your Honor, Chris Samis 24 here, Potter Anderson, today on behalf of the noteholders,

along with my co-counsel Mr. Newton from MoFo, Mr. Newton

25

would like to make a couple of comments surrounding the DIP. 1 2 THE COURT: Certainly. 3 MR. SAMIS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Newton, great to have you here. 5 had the pleasure --6 MR. NEWTON: Thank you. 7 THE COURT: -- of admitting you to practice pro 8 hac vice this morning. 9 MR. NEWTON: Yes, thank you very much, and thanks 10 for the time. I rise similarly, you know, with just a short 11 set of comments, having heard Mr. Warren comment on his 12 concerns about the DIP, and to briefly state, you know, the DIP lenders, also prepetition lenders to the enterprise have 13 been working with the company to provide some bridge 14 15 financing over the course of the first quarter to allow the 16 debtors to enter this process with a sale in place, which was signed up in February, and to allow for a smooth transition 17 18 into the bankruptcy case, and to allow for a sale down the 19 road. 20 In connection with providing that prepetition 21

funding, they did not obtain liens on the ABS collateral, in part because that would have been a default under the ABS facilities. But, you know, we'll work with Warner Bros. during the course of the next few weeks here to address their concerns, as I mentioned, they included some reservation of

22

23

24

25

rights language in the order, and we'll continue to work with them ahead of the final hearing. And, as Mr. Warren said, hopefully, we can resolve a number of those issues, but I just wanted to comment on that aspect of the presentation and, you know, given that Mr. Warren was commenting on the lack of liens there. There's a reason for it, it's not a massive amount, there's a lot more prepetition debt, and the DIP lenders are not looking to roll up a lot of the prepetition debt, but we wanted to make this process as smooth and, hopefully, as efficient and economical as possible, and hence the reason for the rollup.

I will -- I'll defer on some of the other issues that Mr. Warren mentioned. You know, the transfer of derivative rights is certainly before my time, and I'm sure we'll have time to discuss that in due course and address it, but I just wanted to stand up for that purpose.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Newton.

MR. NEWTON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bernbrock.

Well, before you make your comments, I'm going to ask you to think about one thing. I do have an 11:30 hearing and I have people waiting for it. Before you begin your comments, would it be productive at all for you to have -- or, well, I guess discussions with some of your colleagues or perhaps with Ms. Sierra-Fox about how you'd like to proceed

to address the objections that Ms. Sierra-Fox raised? Or where do you see yourself with all that at the moment, I guess?

MR. BERNBROCK: Thank you, Your Honor, Justin
Bernbrock of Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, proposed
counsel for the debtors. For a minute there, I was worried
you were going to ask me to tap dance, which is -- I'm unable
to do with Ms. Sierra-Fox. I'm certainly happy to meet and
confer and discuss a potential workaround.

Your Honor raised a couple of questions in connection with the transaction support agreement that I do want to try to address. In the event that this document changes, my understanding, or at least how we built this, the authority then falls away. We're only seeking the authority for this proposed document. And so while we did think about if there were, you know, scrivener's errors or minor modifications, but where we sort of landed was, if it changes at all, we have to come back to the Court.

With respect to the exculpation set forth that Ms. Sierra-Fox raised, we bear the same obligations under the indenture, those are secured, you know, capital ABS, capital O obligations. And so this isn't doing anything new that isn't already in existence.

THE COURT: And by that do you mean the indemnification at paragraph 6.04?

MR. BERNBROCK: Yes, indemnification --

THE COURT: Yeah, okay.

MR. BERNBROCK: -- and exculpation.

THE COURT: Okay, thanks.

MR. BERNBROCK: And, Your Honor, it's not with respect to the servicing, it's not an assumption or proposed assumption because this is a funded debt facility that we cannot under the Bankruptcy Code assume or seek to assume, these are our obligations under the transaction documents.

At the risk of putting Ms. Sierra-Fox on the spot, what the debtors could be comfortable with might be adding some incremental language into the order that gives parties the right to -- that grants the authority, but preserves the rights of parties to object in connection with the final hearing.

And really what I'm trying to do here, so that it's very, very clear, because we are speaking to noteholders quite soon, is if we get the authority and we execute the document and the trustee countersigns, then I know at least that we have done as much as we can to ensure that our ongoing operations, our proposed sale process, et cetera, can remain on track. There could still be, because the indenture only requires a simple majority of 50.1 percent of the holders to give the direction, a holder who says I'm going to pursue my own rights, and what I'm — the language I am

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

proposing would preserve the right of that non-consenting holder, non-directing holder to come in and raise whatever issues they might have. Is that acceptable -- I mean, if we want to go talk about it, I don't want to --THE COURT: Yeah, Ms. Sierra-Fox. MS. SIERRA-FOX: Your Honor -- and I'm also going to be monitoring the 11:30 hearing -- I appreciate the proposal. I don't have authority for that at this time, I'd have to take a break and call my client. Your Honor, I think, not to seem like I don't want to resolve what -- the U.S. Trustee doesn't want to resolve the issue, I think we 12 view this to be sufficiently out of the ordinary where -- I mean, it would be our preference for precedential purposes and just for the reasons I reiterated on the record that Your Honor rule on this and we get -- it end up my client be directed in that way. So, if Your Honor does want -- believes that debtors' counsel's proposal is what -- the preferred route, then that -- my client will have to live with that, but at this point I think I just don't have authority to go that route. THE COURT: I understand. Okay. Mr. Bernbrock.

MR. BERNBROCK: Your Honor, in light of Your

Honor's hearing at 11:30, I'm happy to briefly conclude or if Your Honor -- if we need to step away, I'm looking to take direction from you. I wanted to make a couple of overarching comments in response to some of what we heard, but let me pause.

THE COURT: On the record before as it stands, okay, I'm not certain that I have enough evidence to support a finding that entry into the transaction support agreement is necessary to avoid immediate and irreparable harm. So to Ms. Sierra-Fox's comment that it may require of an evidentiary record, I think I agree with that. So it may make sense to come back at about -- my day is rough -- I would anticipate my next hearing is approximately an hour -- maybe if we came back at 1 o'clock and I could -- I have time until 2:00. I think that would be enough to probably handle the issues, but it might give you an opportunity to think further about what sort of record you need to build and what testimony you might require.

But it is an unusual transaction and there is nothing wrong with unusual transactions, frankly, it's one of the things that make being a Judge in Delaware a lot of fun is that we get unusual transactions and it's great to see them develop. So I have no problem conceptually with the idea that this is new, but I do think that there is an evidentiary record that has to be built to support the

request for relief before I can rule on it.

Does that make sense?

MR. BERNBROCK: Absolutely. And, to Ms. Sierra-Fox's point, it is the right one, she is correct, and of course as is Your Honor.

Perhaps we could work with Ms. Sierra-Fox -- I know this isn't her evidence, but that which would satisfy her concern as to the threshold, understanding that doesn't satisfy Your Honor, but we could prepare a proffer, a submission that we may tender to the Court perhaps by filing that and -- because there are a number of other, I think, components in the order that we want to work through with a number of parties.

So what I'm suggesting then is we'll work with Ms. Sierra-Fox as to that form of proffer, we'll tender it to --we'll file it with the Court, and then, after we have resolved the language with the parties, perhaps submit two versions of the order, one which authorizes that, if Your Honor were to find that that additional proffer was sufficient for the record, and then one order that does not have that authorization in the order. I'm trying to preserve your calendar and trying to -- I know some folks have flights out as well, but --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. BERNBROCK: -- just an idea.

THE COURT: I understand. Now, Ms. Sierra-Fox is going to be with me for the next hour or more, but, conceptually, it's fine.

Look, I'm certainly satisfied that upon the record that the debtors presented in the form of the two declarations that there is a need for the financing. We are not going to be here on April 11th if we don't get financing in place. So I think that the issue is about the transaction support agreement and whether that's appropriate, appropriately supported by the evidence so as to be approved on an interim basis, and I view that as the sole issue. And I'll make clear, in every other respect, I do find that the debtor has sustained its burden of showing why it's an appropriate exercise of their business judgment to enter into the lending facility, putting a parentheses around the restructuring support -- or transaction support agreement for the moment.

MR. BERNBROCK: I should have thought of this initially and I apologize, Your Honor, perhaps we could just make this a final order issue on normal notice, we'll supplement the record appropriately. If the trustee gets direction, then I've got a signature page from U.S. Bank that says they're not going to do anything. And Mr. Gavant has been eminently reasonable in all respects, I would be shocked to see that he would take action without at least first

calling me, and so I feel reasonably comfortable just -we'll just make this a final hearing issue, normal notice,
and we can then supplement the record.

THE COURT: I think that makes a lot of sense. You know, with first day hearings, one of the things that I think a Judge always has to think about is who is not in the room simply because they don't know yet. They're pretty close to being ex parte hearings, right? And so I certainly appreciate that considered approach to dealing with this and it would make a great deal of sense to me.

MR. BERNBROCK: Well, then, Your Honor, what I would propose is we will -- we'll make that modification to the order, we've got a number of comments to work through with the parties, and I would propose that we would then tender the revised order under certification of counsel and I will -- with respect to Mr. Warren, I'll only say, I'll reiterate something that I said to him over email at the very early hours, that I, as a younger lawyer than Mr. Warren, look forward to actually learning quite a bit because I think that this is going to be an interesting experience. There's no question that there are disputes among these parties, I think that that is quite clear.

And I should have mentioned, my law firm, our partners are not counsel to the debtors with respect to that ongoing arbitration, this is Kirkland & Ellis that is

```
1
    representing them in that proceeding. I should have
 2
    mentioned, my former partners and friends there may be
    frustrated, but they are -- they've been on the line as well,
 3
    but I say all of that to say, thus far, in very limited
 4
 5
    interaction with Mr. Warren, I have a lot of hope that we're
 6
    going to collectively be able to come to a good resolution
 7
    for the benefit of all parties.
 8
               Mr. Rubinstein, the marketing period is open, we
    look forward to your bid and any bid of any party, including
 9
   Mr. Warren and the Warner Bros. studio, we're certainly happy
10
    to entertain any and all competing bids to the proposed
11
    transaction.
12
13
               With that, Your Honor, that does conclude the
   presentation. As I said, we would --
14
15
               THE COURT: Let me just ask one thing. I didn't
16
    ask Ms. Sierra-Fox if that proposed resolution addresses her
17
    comments.
18
               MS. SIERRA-FOX: Yes, Your Honor --
19
               THE COURT: Okay.
20
               MS. SIERRA-FOX: -- Rosa Sierra-Fox on behalf of
21
    the U.S. Trustee, that addresses our comments.
22
               THE COURT: I just wanted to make sure.
23
               MS. SIERRA-FOX: Yes.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. Well, look, thank you for --
25
    I'm sorry, Mr. Mulvihill.
```

MR. MULVIHILL: Your Honor, I'm sorry, before you make your final comment, just one housekeeping matter on the orders. All of the orders have been uploaded except, obviously, for the DIP and cash management order. I just wanted to ask Your Honor, would you like the cash management order with those changes under certification of counsel on the docket?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MR. MULVIHILL: Okay. So we will upload that and, once we have it signed off from all the parties, we will upload the DIP after the hearing.

THE COURT: Okay. And to be clear then, April

11th is the -- will be the final hearing on the motions for
which interim relief is sought today.

MR. MULVIHILL: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay, very good.

Okay. I appreciate the presentations very much, this was really well done, and look forward to seeing you back on the 11th. If anything comes up in the course of getting all the final comments in on the DIP order and you need anything, certainly tomorrow I can -- I can hear you, and certainly any party that would want to appear by Zoom, it would be just fine, but otherwise I'll look out for your certification of counsel on the final DIP order -- or, I'm sorry, the interim DIP order.

MR. BERNBROCK: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay?

MR. BERNBROCK: If I may indulge --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BERNBROCK: -- one final piece? I raise this only to the extent that we have to come back to Your Honor on an emergency basis and I want to make very clear that there is a separate and distinct -- although we share a common ancestry, a separate and distinct enterprise that operates under the Village Roadshow name in Australia, and they operate theaters, they operate theme parks. While the two at one time were related and connected, and there's a very small, de minimis equity holding in the Topco by some of those legacy entities, this is a different -- this case is not that case. We have not filed bankruptcy for those companies and operations; it is a separate and distinct enterprise. However, somewhat unfortunately, we were served a notice dated today that on its face, Your Honor, is a violation of the automatic stay.

I tell you that that's our read, our interpretation of the action that's been taken. We are going to apprise that entity or those entities of the obligations under the automatic stay, and I'm very, very hopeful that we will be able to make clear what the automatic stay requires. If those conversations are unsuccessful, we may bring a

motion to enforce the automatic stay before Your Honor on an expedited basis. THE COURT: Understood. MR. BERNBROCK: I just want to flag that. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BERNBROCK: Otherwise, Your Honor, thank you. THE COURT: Thank you very much. We are adjourned. (Proceedings concluded at 11:43 a.m.) 

CERTIFICATION We certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of our knowledge and ability. /s/ William J. Garling March 19, 2025 William J. Garling, CET-543 Certified Court Transcriptionist For Reliable /s/ Tracey J. Williams March 19, 2025 Tracey J. Williams, CET-914 Certified Court Transcriptionist For Reliable